

Site Inspection Report Summary

Property Address: 6231 PA-88 Finleyville, PA 15332

Inspection Date: 06/10/2020

Inspector: Nathan J. Marcus, E.I.T.

This document is a brief synopsis of the complete seventy page property report.

Narrative of the Site Inspection:

The Andrew Koteles property inspection was arranged by this inspector, Nathan Marcus, at the request of Steve and Linda Levandosky. I contacted Attorney Justin P. Schantz, Esq. at the law firm of David A. Colecchia and Associates, 324 South Maple Avenue, Greensburg, PA 15601-3219 to make arrangements to inspect the property.

Mr. Koteles was present for the inspection on the date of June 10, 2020.

Mr. Koteles was adamant to not allow Mr. and Mrs. Levandosky to join this inspector on touring the property. This represented a deviation from our initial agreement coordinated with Attorney Schantz. Mr. Levandosky constructed a majority of the structures on the property. With his special historical knowledge, Mr. Levandosky would have been helpful to assist in determining the current condition of the property. Due to Mr. Koteles obstinate refusal to allow Mr. and Mrs. Levandosky to join in the property inspection, I proceeded to inspect the property alone.

My inspection included an investigation and condition assessment of both the land and structural improvements present on the property.

In my professional opinion, the land was in poorly maintained condition. Significant overgrowth of grasses and plants were observed in both the front and rear areas of the property. Large plants were present in the rear area of the property. Several were seen growing through parked automobiles. One plant was growing through the inside of a rear structure (the white building). Detailed observations are noted and documented via photographs in the site report.

All major structures on the property were inspected. The major structures included the front garage bays, rear garage bays, and a white garage / equipment building in the rear.

Overall, Mr. Koteles has neglected taking care of the structural improvements on the property. I saw significant deterioration due to a lack of proper maintenance.

Site Inspection Methodology:

The site was inspected starting from the front parking lot near PA SR-88 and proceeding to the rear of the property. The exterior areas of the structures were examined first, followed by the interior areas. Large structural components including roofs, walls, and flooring were examined. Smaller structural elements including electrical, plumbing, heating, and fire protection systems were also examined. No ladders were used to access the roof, attic, or ceiling areas in structures.

Overall Facility Condition:

The property improvements feature obvious deferred maintenance and are in need of some significant repairs. The land has obvious deferred maintenance. Multiple building components need repairs, rehabilitation, or updating. The functional utility and overall facility operational capability are diminished due to condition, but the property remains useable and operational as an automotive repair business.

Detailed Property Description and Significant Deficiencies:

The property's primary use at the time of inspection was that of an automotive repair business. Commercial signage was clearly visible upon initial access to the property from PA State Road Route 88 as to this property usage.

Parking Area:

I observed that the automotive repair facility parking lot was mostly unpaved and lacked a contiguous impervious surface. (Impervious surface being defined as a parking lot constructed of asphalt, concrete, and / or cement). The surface material of the parking lot was primarily gravel. However, the gravel was noted to be thinly distributed throughout the parking lot. Potholes and ruts in the parking lot were clearly visible. The few areas of the parking lot that had impervious surfaces had observable damage due to cracking.

Roof:

Overall, the roof is in poor condition. The roof of the structure containing the main garage bays closest to PA SR-88 was observed first. Viewed from the "front-side" of the building, there was visible roof sagging concentrated at a depression in the roof shingles. Viewed from the "rear-side" of the building, there was obvious deterioration in the condition of most of the roof shingles. Damage to the roof flashing was observed along the sides of the building. Wood paneling under the roof structure needs repainted. An unsecured roof downspout was observed during the inspection. Failure to correct the roof will lead to further damage and a diminution in property value.

Fire Protection:

Fire protection of the facility was checked during the site inspection. The fire protection strategy is inadequate.

As an automobile facility, there are inevitably oil spills and oily rags that accumulate during the operation of the business. This creates a higher-than-average flammability risk.

In the front maintenance bays, one small fire extinguisher was found during the course of inspection in an unmarked location on the floor. This area is filled with miscellaneous items not related to fire suppression. Fire extinguishers should be clearly marked and mounted on the wall.

In the rear garage bay storage area, (the rear portion of the main building with the largest garage doors located at the property), a large quantity of rubber tires not on rims were observed to be piled up in the room. No ceiling mounted sprinkler system above the tires or any fire extinguishers were observed in the tire storage room. The tire storage area is in the same overall structure as the front maintenance bays where most customers and customer vehicles are located.

The white building on the portion of the property farthest from PA SR-88 had an observable large burn mark on the ground adjacent to the right exterior area of the structure. Multiple open containers of oil were found inside of the structure. Only one partially charged fire extinguisher, (covered in spider webs with an outdated inspection tag), was found inside of the white building.

Exterior Lighting:

Exterior lighting to illuminate the outside areas of the property at night was unable to be tested to see if it was operational on the day of inspection. Mr. Koteles was asked to operate the exterior lighting. However, he claimed not to know how to turn on the lighting during daylight hours.

Garage Service Bays:

The front service bays have significant wear and tear. The front service bays need maintenance. The brick pillars between the service bay garage doors were damaged. Also, the garage doors had moderate damage and scrapes visible. There are large areas of the ceiling in the main service bays with significant damage. Large holes in the ceiling were observed. Some cracking of the cement floor in the front service bay area was noted. Rear shelving on the walls of the front service bay was crooked. Possibly, the shelving has been overloaded at times to create this condition. Burn and exhaust marks were observed on a wall to the left side of the garage area.

The rear service bays are currently used primarily for tire and miscellaneous junk storage. No fire protection was observed in this area. The flooring of this garage area is an unfinished surface of dirt and gravel. Oil stains were noted on the unfinished surface. The storm doors accessing this structure are in a damaged condition with extensive rust, trim, and lock damage. The large rear garage doors were not tested for operational capability during the inspection.

The rear white building appears to be used for maintenance projects and miscellaneous equipment storage. The steel storm door to access the building has extensive trim rot. The inside of the building has several oil stains noted on the flooring. At the rear of the building under a blue steel wall cabinet, an outside weed plant was observed to be growing through the exterior wall to the inside of the building.

Steel Access Doors:

All of the doors for customer and employee access to the building had significant amounts of wear and tear. There are various amounts of visible rust on the steel portions of all the doors. It is recommended to repaint the doors. Multiple doors have striker plate damage. A door to access the rear service bays with tire storage has significant damage to the lower door plate. The white building access door at the far rear of the property has extensive rot around the door trim.

Electrical:

In the front service bay area, one area had a large amount of equipment plugged into one electrical circuit.

In the white building at the rear of the property, the light switch closest to the access door to the building was missing a light switch cover.

Landscaping:

There was a noticeable amount of high grass and large weeds observable throughout the property.

The rear storage lot has the largest quantity of plant overgrowth. At least one vehicle in the rear lot area was observed to have been parked so long that plants are growing through the vehicle. There are large plants growing adjacent to the rear white building.

The plants near the property utility connections at the main front garage building needs trimmed.

A wasp nest was found adjacent to the inside of the door to access the rear storage area.

Conclusion:

Overall, Mr. Koteles has neglected taking care of the structural improvements included on the property. I saw significant deterioration due to a lack of proper maintenance.

These deficiencies and additional property condition information are recorded in the complete seventy page property report.

Inspector: Nathan Marcus, E.I.T